

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

After entry of the foregoing amendments, Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, 19-25, and 27-32 are pending in the present application. The present amendment amends Claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 17, 19, 25, and 27; and cancels Claims 2, 10, 18, 26, and 33-44 without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 43 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph; Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 12-15, 17, 20-23, 25, and 28-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,884,056 to Steele; Claims 2, 8, 10, 16, 18, 24, 26 and 32-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Steele in view of EP 1 024 444 A2 to Hori; and Claims 3, 11, 19, and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Steele, Hori, and obvious engineering design choice.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 43 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, that rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of those claims.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 12-15, 17, 20-23, 25, and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Steele, independent Claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 are amended to recite the subject matter of previously presented Claims 2, 10, 18, and 26 (which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Steele in view Hori). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 12-15, 17, 20-23, 25, and 28-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Steele be withdrawn.

Turning now to the rejections of Claims 2, 8, 10, 16, 18, 24, 26, and 32-44 and Claims 3, 11, 19, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Steele in view Hori, those rejections are respectfully traversed.

Though they are different in scope, each of amended independent Claims 1, 9, 17, and 25 recites still pictures, which are extracted from a picture stream including both scene-changing still pictures and non-scene-changing still pictures; and recites a transmission sequence to transmit the still pictures in one series, which is different than the sequence of the still pictures in the picture stream, such that each of the scene-changing still pictures of the transmission sequence are transmitted prior to the non-scene-changing still pictures. The remaining pending claims depend from Claims 1, 9, 17, and 25.

The Office Action cites only Hori as teaching a transmission sequence of both scene-changing still pictures and non-scene-changing still pictures; and as teaching the claimed sequence priority of the scene-changing still pictures.¹ Applicants note that neither Steele nor Hori teach the claimed transmission sequence.

Steele discloses a system and method for video browsing over a network. In the reference, the graphical user interface displays a set of points such as thumbnail representations of scene cut-points within an object. A user selects an interval between two representations, whereby a new set of points between the selected interval be transmitted and displayed.² Thus, Steele merely “zeros in” on a desired thumbnail.³ Steele does not reorder the scene-changing still pictures and non-scene-changing still pictures for transmission.

Hori discloses an image information describing method, video retrieval method, video reproducing method, and video reproducing apparatus. Hori samples video frames in video data via time intervals, and provides them attribute information. Though Hori mentions the presence of still images between scene change points, the reference does not teach the claimed reordering of still images for transmission as one series.

¹ Office Action, 5/19/2005, page 7.

² Steele, Abstract; Figure 4; and col. 6, lines 13-35.

³ Steele, Abstract.

The claimed invention extracts and reorders scene-changing still pictures and non-scene-changing still pictures; and then transmits the reordered still pictures in one series.

Neither Steele nor Hori teaches that feature.

Accordingly, for the above-stated reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of Claims 2, 8, 10, 16, 18, 24, 26 and 32-44 and Claims 3, 11, 19, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Steele in view Hori be withdrawn.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
EHK/STD:aif